

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	South Sutter Water District	Amount Requested	\$2,874,852
Proposal Title	Camp Far West Spillway Improvement Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,750,563

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located on the Bear River, approximately 6 miles east of the Wheatland, in Yuba and Placer Counties. The project modifies the Camp Far West Reservoir to increase storage capacity by 9,830 acre feet. Increased storage capacity will allow the South Sutter Water District to provide additional irrigation water to local agricultural interests and reduce flood risk to nearby communities.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	4/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	2/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	12/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5	Program Preferences	4/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			36

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The tasks for each project are provided; however, not with adequate detail. For example, in the work plan, Task 7 - Construction includes a very brief description of what will be done; however, this discussion is incomplete compared to Attachment 4-2 (in the budget) which provides a detail list of construction items. The design level is stated to be at 90% within the narrative but plans/specs are not included with the submittal as explicitly required by the PSP (pg. 29). No preliminary CEQA assessment is provided and reference to NEPA compliance is not addressed beyond providing a blanket statement that mitigation is not anticipated, and a reference to required federal permits. The applicant provides goals and objectives of the proposal (Section 1.1) and how they related to the IRWM Plan (Section 1.2.1). Finally, project deliverables are not included in the work plan.

BUDGET

The proposal includes detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the budget categories described in Exhibit B. Sums are not consistent between all budget task item summaries and the budget item details (Table 4.1). Lump sums are routinely included in the budget but adequate supporting documentation is not provided. The level of detail provided in the budget is inconsistent with a project at 90% design.

SCHEDULE

Although it appears that construction can begin by October 2014, it is difficult to determine if the schedule is reasonable. The tasks listed in the schedule are not consistent with those presented in the work plan. The schedule is limited to month and year start/end dates; interdependencies between tasks are not shown. Significant milestones and deliverable dates are not provided for each task.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant did not provide quantifiable targets or appropriate measurement tools for targets associated with any of the six goals outlined in the work plan. The applicant does not indicate where data will be collected or what types of analysis will be used. A second table is referenced (Table 6.2) but not included in the proposal. Based on the information provided, it is unclear whether the Proposal can meet intended goals.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

Technical justification for the project cannot be determined based upon the information provided. Insufficient documentation demonstrating the technical adequacy of the project is included in the proposal, and some physical benefits are not well described. The physical benefits claimed for the water supply goal are supported by documentation and well described; however, the physical benefits claimed for flood damage reduction are not documented or well described. Information provided in this attachment includes information that does not support the benefits of completing the dam modifications. Flood damage information presented is based on a 1 in 6,000 year flood event. This indicates that completion of the project will not result in flood damage benefits for lesser storms (1 in 100, 1 in 200, etc.) The dam's primary function appears to be water supply. The information presented does not provide adequate documentation supporting the dam's use for flood control.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. The total construction cost is shown in Attachment 4 as \$5.75 million. No cost table, other operating and maintenance costs, or adjustments are provided in Attachment 8. Overall, the rigor and quality of the analysis of flood inundation area, frequency, inundation depths, and structures affected is lacking. If the event damages from the two extremely infrequent flood events are removed from the analysis, the project benefits could range anywhere from low to high.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

This proposal claims to meet 6 program preferences. This proposal demonstrated a high degree of certainty for the following program preferences: Contribute to the attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Drought Preparedness, Climate Change Response Actions, and Practice Integrated Flood Management.